

NEW JERSEY MILITIA NEWSLETTER

Volume IX, Issue No. 12

June 2004

All persons are by nature free and independent, and have certain natural and unalienable rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing, and protecting property, and of pursuing and obtaining safety and happiness.

-- Article 1, Section 1, New Jersey State Constitution

Rights during War

By Dave Kopel

When Attorney General John Ashcroft officially recognized that the Second Amendment is an individual right, gun prohibitionists attacked him for changing the Department of Justice policy promulgated by Richard Nixon's AG -- whose official policy asserted that the Second Amendment was *not* an individual right. President Lyndon Johnson's AG, while not creating an official policy, also denied that the Second Amendment protected an individual right.

But prior to the Johnson-Nixon era, things were very different. Let's take a look at the first Supreme Court case in which the Department of Justice cited the Second Amendment.

During the Civil War, in 1864, an Indiana man named Lambdin P. Milligan was charged with aiding the southern rebellion. Although Indiana was under Union control and the courts were functioning, Milligan was tried before a military court and sentenced to death. In 1866, a unanimous Supreme Court overturned Milligan's conviction, holding that martial law can only be applied in theaters of war, and not in areas where the civil courts were functioning. (*Ex Parte Milligan*, 71 U.S. 2)

Though the Court did not discuss the Second Amendment the Attorney General did.

Milligan's lawyers had claimed that Congress could never impose martial law because the Fourth Amendment (no searches without warrants), Fifth Amendment (no criminal trials without due process), and Sixth Amendment (criminal defendants have a right to a jury trial) do not contain any exceptions for wartime.

The AG, in defending the legality of Milligan's death sentence, retorted that under conditions of war, the Bill of Rights does not apply. Thus, the federal government could disarm a rebel, without violating his Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms. The AG urged the Court to construe the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Amendments *in pari materia* (as being of the same cloth).

He claimed that in times of war, the President was the sole judge of the necessity of what needed to be done: "After war is originated, whether by declaration, invasion, or insurrection, the whole power of conducting it, as to manner, and as to all the means and appliances by which war is carried ..., is given to the President. He is the sole judge of the exigencies, necessities, and duties of the occasion, their extent and duration."

Noting that Milligan's defense was based on the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments the AG continued: "In addition to these, there are two preceding amendments which we may also mention, to wit: the second and third. They are thus:

"2. A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed.

"3. No soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, nor in time of war but in a manner to be prescribed by law."

He then came to the heart of the argument: if the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments apply in time of war, so does the Second. And that would lead to the absurd result of the government forbidden to disarm the enemy: "It will be argued that the

fourth, fifth, and sixth articles, as above given, are restraints upon the war-making power; but we deny this. All these amendments are *in pari materia*, and if either is a restraint upon the President in carrying on war, in favor of the citizen, it is difficult to see why all of them are not.

"Yet will it be argued that the fifth article would be violated in 'depriving of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law,' armed rebels marching to attack the capital? Or that the fourth would be violated by searching and seizing the papers and houses of persons in open insurrection and war against the government? It cannot properly be so argued, any more than it could be that it was intended by the second article (declaring that 'the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed') to hinder the President from disarming insurrectionists, rebels, and traitors in arms while he was carrying on war against them.

"These, in truth, are all peace provisions of the Constitution and, like all other conventional and legislative laws and enactments, are silent amidst arms, and when the safety of the people becomes the supreme law."

Thus the AG concluded that all of the Bill of Rights had an implicit exception for wartime necessity.

President Lincoln's Attorney General explained that the Second Amendment belongs to individuals, but if a Confederate rebel were disarmed, his Second Amendment right would not be violated, since the Second Amendment would not apply to him -- even though the Second Amendment has no explicit exception for wartime. Likewise, if Congress declared martial law a civilian would be subjected to a court martial,

rather than trial by jury, even though the Sixth Amendment (which guarantees jury trials) has no explicit exception for wartime. The AG plainly saw the Second Amendment as guaranteeing an individual right.

The U.S. government made another argument showing that the Second Amendment belongs to individuals. Milligan's attorney, David Dudley Field, made much of the fact that the Fifth Amendment's requirement that persons could only be tried if they had first been indicted by a grand jury had an explicit exception for military circumstances ("except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia when in actual service in time of war or public danger"). He pointed out that Milligan (a civilian with Confederate sympathies) was plainly not within the terms of the exception.

Benjamin Franklin Butler, arguing for the government, told the Supreme Court that the whole Bill of Rights contained implicit exceptions which were not stated in the text. For example, despite the literal language of the Fifth Amendment and the Second Amendment, slaves in antebellum America had been deprived of liberty without due process and had been forbidden to possess arms: "...the constitution provides that 'no person' shall be deprived of liberty without due process of law. And yet, as we know, whole generations of people in this land -- as many as four millions of them at one time -- people described in the Constitution by this same word, 'persons,' have been till lately deprived of liberty ever since the adoption of the Constitution, without any process of law whatever.

"The Constitution provides, also, that no 'person's' right to bear arms shall be infringed; yet these same people, described elsewhere in the Constitutions as 'persons, have been deprived of their arms whenever they had them."

Butler's point was that the right to arms and the right not to be deprived of liberty without due process were individual rights guaranteed to all "persons." Yet despite the literal guarantee to all "persons," slaves had been deprived of their liberty without a fair trial, and had not been allowed to own or carry guns. Thus, there must an implicit "slavery exception" in the Second Amendment and the Fifth Amendment. And if there could be an unstated "slavery exception," there could also be an unstated "in time of

war" exception.

Butler's argument rebuts the claim that the Second Amendment right does not belong to individuals. It also refutes the gun prohibitionists' assertion that the Second Amendment can only be violated when the federal government interferes with state militias. There were no federal laws forbidding states to enroll slaves in the state militias. (The federal militia was whites-only, but this did not prevent the states from structuring their own militias as they saw fit.) But there were state laws forbidding individual blacks to possess arms. So Butler's argument assumed that the Second Amendment right to arms inhered in individuals -- including slaves.

The *Milligan* case provides one more bit of evidence that the individual rights view of the Second Amendment was originally the only view. The notion that the Second Amendment does not belong to individuals was created in the twentieth century, by the Kansas Supreme Court in the 1905 case of *Salinas v. Blaksley*.

What Guns Should I Own?

By Brad Edmonds

When I write in defense of gun ownership, I get emails from readers who don't own guns, but think they should. The usual question is, "what guns are the best ones, and why?" The short answer is, there's no short answer. Who you are and the circumstances you face determine what would be the best weapons for you. That being the case, it is possible to make some general statements that readers may find useful, so here they are:

One of the best personal weapons is a .45-caliber pistol. The primary advantage of the .45 is its stopping power. With an expanding (hollow-point) round, the .45 will make a .45-inch hole where it enters a person, and a large hole where it leaves -- if it leaves him. The bullet travels relatively slowly, giving it time to expand; and it has a lot of weight, which helps literally stop the forward motion of an attacker. It packs a huge punch. More "powerful" handguns, such as a .357 magnum or my 10mm pistol (effectively a .40 magnum), by contrast, send the bullet at too high a speed for it to expand much when it hits a person. These more "macho" weapons are not as effective at stopping an attacker as a .45.

Disadvantages of the .45

include its size and weight; its relatively low ammo capacity compared to, say, a 9mm pistol; and the fact that it's a pistol, which means maintenance is more time consuming and complicated than for a revolver. Hence, a 9mm pistol is a good alternative. Its higher ammo capacity helps make up for its lower stopping power, and its lower weight and milder recoil make it more suitable for folks with smaller forearms.

With pistols and revolvers alike, smaller caliber can (but doesn't necessarily) mean greater ammo capacity, milder recoil, and smaller overall size -- an advantage for concealment. You, perhaps with the help of a personal advisor, must decide which tradeoffs are best for you.

Revolvers usually hold only six cartridges, compared to around nine for a .45, and 10 to 16 for a 9mm pistol. Also, revolvers, for a given level of power, tend to have greater recoil than pistols. Pistols absorb some of the recoil by using it to load the next round. The advantages: Revolvers tend to be smaller than pistols, and tend to require simpler, speedier maintenance.

If you want something you can carry on your person, then a handgun is the only choice. If you want something strictly for home defense, a handgun is a pretty bad choice. In the heat of the moment, it may be very difficult to hit your target. For home defense, you want a shotgun preferably one with a short barrel and no choke. Choke is a narrowing of the inside of the barrel near the muzzle (the end of the barrel you point at the target). Choke produces a tighter shot pattern, which is great for hunting, but bad for home defense. You want to paste the biggest area possible.

The next question is whether you want a pump-action or semi-automatic shotgun.

I prefer the pump shotgun for my own house, and I don't keep a round in the chamber ready to fire. This offers two advantages: The sound of you pumping the shotgun to load a round will give a warning, which will usually be enough to send an intruder fleeing. More important, in the case that a member of your own family shocks you awake, you give them a chance to say "it's me." (Don't get the idea that this ever really happens -- given the mainstream media bias against guns, we'd hear about it every time a homeowner shot a family member in the middle of the night, mistaking him for an intruder. Such cases are

In the beginning of change the patriot is a scarce man, brave, hated and scorned. When his cause succeeds, however, the timid join him, for then it costs nothing to be a patriot. -- Mark Twain

exceedingly rare.)

Ex-military types say that pumping the shotgun is a bad idea – it gives away your position and your strength. That is absolutely correct in combat situations. If you've crept into a building in enemy territory, you don't want to give away your position. At home, however, if the lights are off, you DO want to be sure whom you're shooting.. If there's more than one intruder, they're still likely to flee at the sound of the pump action. If they don't, you're in an extremely unusual and dangerous circumstance. Consult people with more expertise than I have for those situations, but common sense is a partial guide.

For example, if you and your wife are the only adults in your home, and you see an adult-sized silhouette across the room while you can feel your wife next to you on the bed, the silhouette is very likely to be an intruder. The decision to shoot deserves the most serious consideration. I can say this much: Learning, discussing, and rehearsing will vastly improve the likelihood of your making a good decision if the occasion ever arises.

With a semi-automatic shotgun, you don't have the option of making the pump noise before firing.

High-powered rifles are not good for personal or indoor home defense. I still say homes should have them, as they are a persuasive last line of community defense against foreign invasion or your own government coming to take your guns away, à la Waco. High-powered rifles pack an extreme punch, and have a very long range compared to handguns and shotguns.

So those are the options: handgun, shotgun, and rifle. There is a best weapon – or, more accurately, best of each category – for you. But you must learn for yourself, and the fastest way to do that is go to a gun shop and ask questions (in addition to doing some reading). The guy at the gun shop can look at you, listen to you, and ask his own questions.

A columnist can't advise you whether you should buy a gun at all. For example, you may be manic-depressive, or live with someone who is. A gun in the house might present an unacceptable suicide risk. The only thing I can say with certainty to someone I don't know is this: **An armed populace will experience lower crime rates, less risk of foreign invasion, and less risk of being subjects of a totalitarian government than a disarmed**

populace. I own a pistol and a shotgun, and am shopping for a rifle.

--Brad Edmonds' book, *There's a Government in Your Soup*, is due out this summer.

Achtung, Mein Liebchen!

WASHINGTON -- The Selective Service System has proposed registering women for the military draft and requiring that young Americans regularly inform the government about whether they have training in niche specialties needed in the armed services.

The proposal, which the agency's acting Director Lewis Brodsky presented to senior Pentagon officials just before the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq, also seeks to extend the age of draft registration to 34 years old, up from 25.

The Selective Service System plan was obtained under the Freedom of Information Act.

Mandatory registration for the draft was suspended in 1975 but was resumed in 1980 by President Carter after the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. About 13.5 million men, ages 18 to 25, currently are registered with the Selective Service.

At present, the Selective Service is authorized to register only young men and they are not required to inform the government about any professional skills. Separately, the agency has in place a special registration system to draft health care personnel in more than 60 specialties into the military if necessary in a crisis.

Some of the skill areas where the armed forces are facing "critical shortages" include linguists and computer specialists, the agency said. Americans would then be required to regularly update the agency on their skills until they reach age 35.

-- Seattle *Post-Intelligencer*, May 3, 2004

The MATRIX

ALBANY, N.Y. (AP) - New York and Wisconsin have pulled out of a program that civil libertarians say endangers citizens' privacy rights by sharing criminal, prison and vehicle information with one another and cross-reference the data with privately held databases.

Known as Multistate Anti-Terrorism Information Exchange, Matrix links government records with up to 20 billion records in databases held by Seisint Inc., a private company based in Boca Raton, Fla.

The Seisint records include details on property, boats and Internet

domain names that people own, their address history, utility connections, bankruptcies, liens and business filings, according to an August report by the Georgia state Office of Homeland Security.

The American Civil Liberties Union has complained that Matrix could be used by state and federal investigators to compile dossiers on people who have never been suspected of a crime. Seisint officials have said safeguards are built into the system to prevent such abuses.

Alabama, California, Colorado, Georgia, Louisiana, Kentucky, Oregon, South Carolina, Texas, Utah and West Virginia have all left or declined to join after actively considering it.

Matrix began in 2002 in Florida. Connecticut, Michigan, Ohio and Pennsylvania also remain participants in the program, which was helped by \$12 million in initial funding from the federal government.

-- AP, March 11, 2004

Zero Tolerance & "No Real Judgment"

HIGHLAND PARK, Texas – Police in this Dallas suburb handcuffed a 97-year-old woman and hauled her to jail or having an expired registration sticker. Police said they have a no-exceptions policy. Everyone gets treated the same - arrested, handcuffed, and taken to jail -- even on minor traffic warrants.

Dolly Kelton was driving herself to the beauty shop when she was arrested for neglecting to pay a previous ticket for the same expired sticker.

"They just clipped these things on me -- in front, not in back -- and when I got into the jail, they took them off," Kelton said. "I was really getting a little mad by that time because I thought it was so unnecessary and so ridiculous."

Inside, police booked her into jail like any other criminal, Kelton said. "They fingerprinted me and took all these pictures of me," she said. She was in police custody for about two hours before her attorney arrived and she was released.

She accepts the blame and doesn't fault the police for doing their duty. "I think it's still stupid and uncalled for," she said. "They ought to be out on the street arresting criminals, not poor, aged ladies."

Now, one of Kelton's sons is questioning the former finishing-school teacher's treatment by police. Her son

told *The Dallas Morning News* the family's real beef "is that no real judgment was displayed" in the incident. --WKMKG-TV, Central Florida, April 28, 2004

* * *

I was born an American. I live as an American; I shall die an American; and I intend to perform the duties incumbent upon me in that character to the end of my career. I mean to do this with absolute disregard to personal consequences. What are the personal consequences? What is the individual man with all the good or evil that may betide him, in comparison with the good and evil which may befall a great country, and in the midst of great transactions which concern that country's fate? Let the consequences be what they will, I am careless, No man can suffer too much, and no man can fall too soon, if he suffer or if he fall, in the defense of the liberties and Constitution of his country. -- Daniel Webster

* * *

"In the next century, nations as we know it will be obsolete; all states will recognize a single, global authority. National sovereignty wasn't such a great idea after all." -- Strobe Talbot, President Clinton's Deputy Secretary of State, as quoted in *Time*, July 20th, 1992

Fleshing Out Skull & Bones - The Whole Story

Since two of our last three Presidents have been lifelong Adepts in Skull & Bones secret society, and since our current President has refused to disavow this society, it is highly important for us to know exactly what kind of society this is. This chronicle of espionage, drug smuggling, and elitism in Yale University's Skull & Bones society offers rare glimpses into his secret world.

Book is 712 pages, with 8 color photos, 80 black/white photos, 16 illustrations and 24 charts.

Reports previously unpublished documents, photographs, and articles that delve deeply into issues such as racism, financial ties to the Nazi Party and illegal corporate dealings. Book prints a complete list of known members, including George Bush and George W. Bush, and reprints of rare magazine articles on the Order of Skull & Bones. It is absolutely amazing the depth of material available to a skilled and determined researcher. Authors include journalists, historians, a professor emeritus of political science, and a newspaper editor; the only drawback is that this book does not deal

with the severe occult side of this society. However, the shocking secular information it does contain needs to be imparted to every citizen in America. Price: \$32.95

--www.cuttingedge.org

Ed.: Sen. John Kerry is also a Bonesman.

Passing the Buck in Iraq

By Rep. Ron Paul

Members of Congress decry the fact that the administration did not inform Congress of the prisoner abuses in Iraq and purposely kept Congress out of the information loop. Yet Congress made it clear to the administration from the very beginning that it wanted no responsibility for the war in Iraq. If Congress wanted to be kept in the loop it should have vigorously exercised its responsibilities. This means, first and foremost, that Congress should have voted on a declaration of war as required by the Constitution. Congress, after abandoning this responsibility in October 2002, now complains it is in the dark. Who is to say the legal ambiguity created by the congressional refusal to declare war may not have contributed to the mentality that prisoners need not be treated in accordance with the Geneva Convention? Until Congress takes up its constitutional responsibilities, complaints that the administration is not sufficiently forthcoming with information ring hollow.

Congress has the power – and the obligation – to keep itself better informed. Congress should hold hearings on the torture allegations, exercising its subpoena power if necessary. Demanding that the administration investigate the matter is simply another example of Congress passing the buck. That's what got us into trouble in the first place.

Elitist Deserves the Best

Chicago Alderman Arenda Troutman has achieved a new low in elitism, insisting that she deserves special police protection after a series of burglaries at her South Side home. Meanwhile her illegally-disarmed constituents are left like defenseless sheep in a city of wolves.

The Chicago *Sun-Times* reported May 6 that Troutman's home, has a police officer assigned 24/7 to watch the residence, including weekends. Troutman said, "Deserve it? Damn right. I should receive the protection I am receiving. I am an elected official. You're darn right."

Stunned by Troutman's cavalier attitude, SAF Founder Alan

Gottlieb said, "What happens if another citizen needs police protection? In a gun-free gulag like Chicago, everyone should have around-the-clock personal police protection.

"While she is part of a city government that makes it virtually impossible for average citizens to protect themselves from burglary and other crime, here's Troutman saying she deserves special treatment because she's an elected official."

-- SAF Press Release May 10, 2004

UN Plan for Internet Control Inches Forward

By Cheryl K. Chumley

The United Nations has raised the spectre of government-controlled Internet.

"[W]hat we mean by Internet governance is a subject of debate. But the world has a common interest in ensuring the security and dependability of this new medium," said Secretary-General Kofi Annan at the March 25-26 U.N. Global Forum on Internet Governance. "The medium must be made accessible and responsive to the needs of all the world's people."

In UN-speak, that means America better ready itself, once again, to relinquish more of its freedoms and hard-earned dollars to support the policies and expenses of a socialist system that demands equality for all at whatever cost.

The idea of government control of the Internet is not new, not even in this country.

Rep. Christopher Cox (R-CA), for instance, wants a permanent moratorium on Internet taxation, while Sen. Lamar Alexander (R-TN) proposes to tax email and Internet access. The difference between these contrasting controls of course, is that congressional representatives are accountable to their constituents whereas UN members and bureaucrats are not.

So when Annan announces a "common interest" in providing Internet access to "all the world's people," suspicion should be the prevailing emotion among all those who claim reverence for the right of the individual and for free market dogma.

This UN push for control is not going to die. Another meeting is planned in Tunis Nov. 16-18, 2005 for member states, including America, to report on how the UN's principles and action plans have been implemented. Here's the gist of what we face, from the Declaration of Principles:

"The international management of the Internet should be multilateral,

transparent and democratic. It should ensure an equitable distribution of resources."

So what does this mean to you, an American with constitutionally guaranteed individual rights, freedoms, privacies and free-market abilities? Well, that niggling "equality for all" philosophy is the socialist's dream of achieving absolute uniformity among those of dissimilar abilities and resources that runs completely contrary to our constitutional system of capitalism.

In its Plan of Action the UN lists ten goals, most aimed at linking Internet users and records to one, single, master global system. Planned connections include "villages, universities, colleges, secondary schools and primary schools, scientific and research centers, public libraries, cultural centers, museums, post offices and archives, health centers and hospitals (and) all local and central government departments."

Also planned is adapting "all primary and secondary school curricula to meet the challenges of the Information Society," ensuring world-wide access to television and radio and encouraging "conditions in order to facilitate the presence and use of all world languages on the Internet."

By their own statements, UN members want access to medical records. They want to know what's being taught in the schools, from elementary grades through college. They want to keep abreast of all scientific advancements. They want to know what's being mailed, what's being exhibited in museums and what's being discussed in town hall meetings -- by 2015.

Once realized, our free-market system will surely crumble. Not only does the UN call for sharing technology with disadvantaged and possibly even hostile states, but the UN will also be in position to impose whatever access and usage fees it deems necessary for the good of all, to regulate business, and to oversee all content placed on the Internet for public access.

-- NewsWithViews.com, April 25, 2004

Rewarding UN Members Who Hate the United States

In the United Nations General Assembly Egypt votes against the United States 79% of the time but still receives \$2 billion annually in US Foreign Aid.

Jordan votes against us 71% of the time and receives \$192 million annually in US Foreign Aid.

India votes against us 81% of the time and receives \$143 million annually in US Foreign Aid.

Pakistan votes against us 75% of the time and receives \$6 million annually in US Foreign Aid. [Aid has increased substantially since 9/11. -- Ed.]

Most countries receive U.S. foreign aid and vote against us in the United Nations. In ascending order the naysayers are ranked as follows:

Both Kuwait and Qatar vote against the U.S. 67% of the time.

Both Morocco and the United Arab Emirates vote against the U.S. 70% of the time.

Both Jordan and Tunisia vote against the U.S. 71% of the time.

Saudi Arabia votes against the U.S. 73% of the time.

Yemen, Algeria and Oman all vote against the U.S. 74% of the time.

Both Pakistan and Sudan vote against the U.S. 75% of the time.

Libya votes against the U.S. 76% of the time.

Egypt votes against the U.S. 79% of the time.

Lebanon votes against the U.S. 80% of the time.

India votes against the U.S. 81% of the time.

Syria votes against the U.S. 84% of the time.

Mauritania votes against the U.S. 87% of the time.

Perhaps it is time to get out of the UN and give the tax savings back to the American workers who are having to scrimp, skimp and sacrifice to pay the taxes??

Pass it along. Everyone needs to know this. Might even mention it to your congressman, who votes for it... what a disgrace.

No Child Left Unbrainwashed

By Jodie Gilmore

Public education became popular in the 18th century, when Prussian monarchs decided the best way to raise good Prussians was to control their education. Writing for the *Action Institute for the Study of Religion and Liberty*, Michiel Visser states: "Pupils were not primarily supposed to learn reading, writing, arithmetic or anything else, but were meant to become obedient citizens. The history of modern education, then, is a history of *social control*...."

In the mid-1600s, philosopher Gottfried Wilhelm Leibnitz wrote: "Make me the master of education, and I will undertake to change the world."

In 1763 the French philosopher Caradeuc de la Chalotais declared in his *Essay on National Education*: "I claim the right to demand for the Nation an

education that will depend upon the State alone; because it belongs essentially to it, because every nation has an inalienable and imprescriptible right to instruct its members, and finally because the children of the State should be educated by members of the State." In the same year, Frederick II of Prussia made schooling compulsory for all children between five and thirteen.

Other monarchs followed Prussia's lead. Empress Maria Theresa used state-controlled education to strengthen her hold over Austria, and state-controlled education systems became popular throughout Europe, particularly after the French Revolution.

The school "reformer" Horace Mann, who toured German schools in the mid-1800s, was largely responsible for introducing compulsory public education, Prussian-style, in the United States.

In the 20th century, state-controlled education marked the reign of nearly every dictator, who recognized that he could mold the minds of the nation's youth through the schools. "At every hour of every day, I can tell you on which page of which book each schoolchild in Italy is studying," boasted Benito Mussolini. On another occasion the fascist ruler declared: "It is the State which educates its citizens in civic virtue, gives them a consciousness of their mission and welds them into unity."

In 1918, shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia, a congress of Party education workers stated, "We must create out of the younger generation a generation of Communists. We must turn children, who can be shaped like wax, into real, good Communists.... We must remove the children from the crude influence of their families. We must take them over and, to speak frankly, nationalize them. From the first days of their lives they will be under the healthy influence of Communist children's nurseries and schools. There they will grow up to be real Communists."

For anyone daring to challenge such totalitarian encroachments upon the family, Hitler confidently stated, "When an opponent declares, 'I will not come over to your side,' I calmly say, 'Your child belongs to us already.... What are you? You will pass on. Your descendants, however, now stand in the new camp. In a short time they will know nothing else but this new community.'"

Our public education system is based on the philosophy of John Dewey, who was heavily influenced by the German-trained George Sylvester Morris, a Hegelian philosopher. It should be kept in mind that Georg Hegel was

the ideological godfather for modern collectivists of every stripe.

A collectivist, humanist and atheist, Dewey viewed so-called "progressive education" as a medium for social development and control. He lavished praise on the Soviet school system, writing: "That which distinguishes the Soviet system both from other national systems and from the progressive schools of other countries is the conscious control of every educational procedure by reference to a single and comprehensive social purpose."

Dewey was a signer of the 1933 *Humanist Manifesto*. Two tenets of the manifesto state that "the universe" is "self-existing and [was] not created," and that "the traditional dualism of mind and body must be rejected." Dewey himself wrote: "There is no God, and there is no soul. Hence, there are no needs for the props of traditional religion. With dogma and creed excluded then immutable truth is also dead and buried. There is no room for fixed, natural law or permanent moral absolutes."

Of course, Dewey had no intention of replacing a belief in God with an intellectual vacuum. He declared that "the teacher is always the prophet of the true God, and the usherer in of the true kingdom of God." Who was atheist Dewey's "true God"? It doesn't require much mental math to determine that Dewey's "true God" and "kingdom of God" was the collectivist state.

As simply one illustration of Dewey's lasting legacy and impact on public education in America, consider the following syllabus from Purdue University's Department of Educational Studies, "Every widely held rationale for social studies education highlights the preeminent role of the social studies in the preparation of these democratic citizens.... Indeed, the National Council for the Social Studies (1994) has defined the primary purpose of the field as helping "young people make informed and reasoned decisions *for the public good* as citizens of a culturally diverse, democratic society in an interdependent world." [Emphasis

added.]

State-controlled education is the same in principle, no matter what it is labeled. Hitler's, Mussolini's and the Bolsheviks' systems of education were designed to compel the children to embrace the State as their savior. Dewey had the same goal. The United States has gone far down the path towards having a nationalized education system, where young people are indoctrinated with "civic virtue" and "a consciousness of their mission" by the State.

Many Americans, when presented with facts such as these, will claim that it is too much of a stretch to compare American public education with the systems of the Nazis, the Communists, and the Fascists. Granted, they do differ, but the difference has been narrowing (and if left unchecked, will continue to narrow) as the public school system is nationalized into a unified system controlled from Washington D.C.

-- *New American*, April 19, 2004

"...teachers who conform to the traditional institutional mode are out of place. They might find fulfillment as tap-dance instructors, or guards in maximum security prisons or proprietors of reducing salons, or agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation - - but they damage teaching, children, and themselves by staying in the classroom." -- NEA book, *Schools For The 70's And Beyond*

"I am convinced that the battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly view their role as the proselytizers of a new faith.... The classroom must and will become an arena of conflict between the old and the new; the rotting corpse of Christianity, together with all its adjacent evils and misery, and the new faith of Humanism."

-- article in The Official Journal of the American Humanist Association (1983)

* * *
Now, however, the educational system has become the weapon of choice for modern liberals in their project of dismantling American culture. --Judge Robert Bork in *Slouching Toward Gomorrah*

Letters to the Editor

Hi NJM,

I have items to give you to further show the loss of the Republic of the United States of America. Only the corporate United States remains. The United States of the World remains the United Nations.

YY

Middlesex County

NJM,

How is it that we have so failed as a people, that we need cops to protect us?

We all know what the court says in *South vs Maryland*, (59 US 396): that no police officer is responsible for anyone's safety!

So if we put it all together: the American People are so worthless they can't be trusted with firearms, and that therefore only government armed guards can be trusted to protect them, but the armed guards are not to be held accountable if YOU are the victim of a crime.

As more citizens are disarmed more citizens and police will be exposed to being killed by criminals!

Even Stalin could not have devised such a plan.

Stalin would fear the likes of Ted Kennedy, Bill Clinton, Barbara Boxer and Dianne Feinstein.

Somewhere the insane are laughing at the American People for what they have done to themselves.

PP

Massachusetts

NJM, P.O. Box 10176, Trenton New Jersey 08650

ISSN 1523-4657

www.njmilitia.org

info@njmilitia.org

walnor@keepandbeararms.com

Middlesex County, Art (732) 607-0833

Wake Co, NC, Dave (919) 363-9410

Morris County, Bill (973) 361-3241

Johnson County, TX, Earl (817) 866-3288

Newsletter Subscription - Donation \$10.00

Cash or Blank Money Order Only

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Phone () _____ E-mail _____